DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 825 HE 002 049

AUTHOR	Sceiford, Chester L.; Wheeler, Ray E., Jr.
TITLE	University Governance: Current Changes and an Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Bureau of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administration, *Annotated Bibliographies, College Students, *Governance, *Higher Education, Innovation, *State Universities, *Student Participation, University Administration

ABSTRACT

The first section of this report discusses the question of university organization and the general problem of student participation in university governance. The bulk of the section deals with different forms of student participation in governance, primarily at state universities. These arrangements include: students on the board of trustees, students on advisory committees, and students added to old and new legislative bodies. The second part is an annotated bibliography on the subject of governance. (AF)

ED048825

University Governance: Current Changes and an Annotated Bibliography

Indiana University Bloomington

Bureau of Institutional Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 049

ED048825

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: CURRENT CHANGES AND AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chester L. Sceiford
and
Ray E. Wheeler, Jr.
Research Assistants

Bureau of Institutional Research
Indiana University

December, 1970

Preface

In the last two years the rising concern of students for the relevance of their collegiate education has evolved into a movement to reshape the educational policy making structure. For those who have wanted to make permanent changes in their educational institutions, they have attempted to secure formal membership on various policy committees including the board of trustees. So far they have been moderately successful.

Proposals of a similar nature have been made to increase the transmission of opinion to administrators, the faculty, and trustees. However, it is the reorganization of the University which has led to new faculty organizations at several Indiana University campuses and to a current effort at writing an all university faculty constitution. These efforts have raised a number of questions about the reorganization changes which other universities have made or are considering.

To meet this need for inter-institutional data, the author of this paper, Mr. Chester Sceiford, consulted with many university officials throughout the United States and searched the growing literature on this topic. As this paper will testify, his appointment as a research assistant at the Bureau was a busy and fruitful one. Completing the work on this project was Mr. Ray Wheeler, a current (1970-71) research assistant in the Bureau. His meticulous checking of citations and continuous attention to the final preparation of this report has facilitated its early publication. The Bureau and the university community are indebted to both of these men for their keen attention to detail and a willingness to see through this project.

The report is in two parts; the first part describes the changes taking place at many of the largest universities, most of which are under state

control. The description and discussion is based on the extensive correspondence between Mr. Sceiford and the presidents (or their designates) at each institution. The second part is an annotated bibliography on the subject of governance; this part of the study may be of interest to anyone in the academic community who is even remotely interested in the topic of university governance. The works cited represent a significant sample of the growing literature on this topic. Hopefully, it will stimulate inquiry as well as inform the reader.

John S. Waggaman
December 1, 1970

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: CURRENT CHANGES AND AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Part I

Current Changes in Governance

Introduction

The word "governance" when applied to colleges and universities is a complex and confused concept. The term covers a whole series of relationships between the constituent parts of the university community, such as: the university and the state legislature, the board of trustees and the administration, the administration and the faculty, the faculty and the students, the administration and the alumni, and so on. All of these relationships taken together can be called the governance structure of a particular institution.

The literature on governance is prolific, but only in recent years has any scientific analysis of university organization been undertaken. The literature is dominated by these first attempts toward explaining the practices of governance and making suggestions on how these structures ought to be organized. Since most of the literature in this field is relatively recent, this paper will concentrate on discussing recent findings and recent proposals regarding governance.

Many institutions of higher education have experimented with new forms of governance. Present day students are asking for more participation in the affairs of their university. Thus, students have been granted various forms of participation which extends from formal membership on the board of trustees

to informal committee roles organized to assist an administrative officer.

The paper will contain a brief look at the university as an organization. Since much debate has been stimulated by the recent student demands for more involvement in decision making, the arguments pro and con on this issue will be reviewed. The author, as a research assistant in the Bureau of Institutional Research, corresponded with some of the schools which have been innovative in this area; this experience and arrangements will be summarized and categorized. Lastly, an annotated bibliography of recent works concerning all aspects of governance will be presented. Faculty as well as students have been active in this field and their changing role also will be examined.

The first portion of the paper draws heavily on the works by Lunsford, Etzioni, Millett, Frankel, Pfnister, Hallberg, Kerlinger, and Powell; citations to their work can be found in the bibliography.

Kinds of University Organization

What is a university? It is a complex organization which employs people and resources brought together for the accomplishment of a certain purpose. This is accomplished through an ordered system of authority and rewards between the members of that organization. What is the nature of that organization? University organization is essentially bureaucratic.

Bureaucracies have certain characteristics which are well known. Some of these are: organizational tasks are distributed among various positions as official duties; there is a division of labor; there is a high degree of specialization; the positions are organized into a hierarchical authority structure; there are established rules and regulations to govern actions and decisions; and officials maintain an informal orientation toward others.

These qualities are clearly discernible in the business service functions of a university; e.g. purchasing, accounting, records and admissions, student personnel services, public relations, etc. They are also evident in special research institutes or bureaus that are generally supported by outside finances and receive little direct university support beyond office space. Certain elements of the curriculum can also be recognized as bureaucratic, in the large general or introductory courses which are required. Usually these courses have many instructors, teaching from a common syllabus and one person responsible as the director or coordinator.

The bureaucratic concept of the university, however, is far from a pure one. Bureaucratic forces are modified by the authority of the faculty, which is often termed collegial authority. In collegial organizations, the bureaucratic elements are altered by placing the locus of decision making in several persons rather than one person. The collegial body is paramount while administrators are usually amateurs and subordinate to it. The power

of individuals in the collegium stems from seniority or superior performance and is personal, not official.

The collegial organization is seen by some as a bureaucratic aberration in that monocratic authority is only replaced by a multi-headed group which is primus inter pares. John D. Millett and others, however, contend that a university is not chiefly characterized by bureaucratic tendencies but the more vague concept of community.

A community does not include a rigid or hierarchical structure and leadership is often diffused and temporary. In a community, communication is intimate and informal; relationships are personal; and people are more important than official connections. A community operates from a principle of consensus. Decisions are reached through conferral and discussion within the group.

Thus, there is some disagreement about the nature of university organization. The weight of the evidence does, however, appear to be on the side of the bureaucratic idea. Features of all three of these organizational types do exist in universities, which points out clearly the complexity of university governance. The faculty and its organization contains most of the collegial and community characteristics, while the administration operates most like the classical bureaucracy. Thus, not all elements of university governance operate in the same manner and tension will result between the different systems.

A great deal of confusion often results from this conflict and tension. One finds a situation where the president is unable to tell the faculty what to do, much less a faculty member. At the same time, a faculty may talk to death an issue when it is asked by the president for advice. Often times delay and no firm resolution results, causing the administrator, often

constricted by a time limit, to go ahead and make a decision, only to receive complaints that the faculty was, in fact, overlooked.

Such situations are commonplace on university campuses throughout the country. Unfortunately, no model system of governance has been conceived to solve this dilemma. The annual tug-of-war between the community/collegial organization of the faculty and the bureaucratic/efficiency structure of the administration recently has been further complicated by the demands of students. They are seeking an active voice in the determination of their educational programs, their style of living, and the policy decisions of the entire university. Students traditionally have not been given a role in the determination of university decisions. At present, there is great disagreement just how and where students should fit into the structure and how much authority they should be delegated.

The New Role for Students in Governance

The question of student participation in university policy making has provoked a number of arguments both pro and con. Those who believe students should have greater participation in governance center their arguments on the democratic community theme. They believe that the university is a community and the students are a vast disenfranchised segment of that community. Students should, therefore, be able to speak out on matters of common interest to the community. Furthermore, colleges and universities should practice the democratic ideal that they seek to perpetuate in the larger society. Students should, therefore, have their opinions heard on a number of issues on an equal basis with the rest of the collegiate community.

Other arguments often used in promoting student involvement are that present day students are more mature and more informed about the problems

facing society. Thus, they are more capable of contributing to and making decisions. Some see the growth of universities creating a need for a student voice. As universities grow larger and more complex, policies tend to become less representative of the people who make up the community; therefore, students should be included in the policy-making structure in order that their views are adequately presented. Others contend that the student has a unique experience in the academic community, one which cannot be adequately evaluated without student insights and inputs.

There have been several challengers to the proposals for student participation in governance. The main arguments against it center upon the lack of experience and expertise of the students. Students come to a university in order to become competent in some field, but their limited background disqualifies them from making sound judgments about high priority matters, such as educational requirements or budget priorities. Students, furthermore, cannot give any continuity to policy making. They can serve only two or three years at most, and then they graduate and leave the community. By the time they have become familiar with the problems and the procedures by which they are solved, they leave and someone new has to be trained. Worse than the lack of continuity, students who make policy in the longer range areas are not present to accept the responsibility for their acts.

Students are, according to some, interested but should prove themselves before being admitted to the policy making councils. Others believe that faculty affairs and student affairs are separate entities and should be kept apart. Each group, it is thought, should organize its own body to deal with and formulate policy in its area. This is the most traditional approach, which proposes that student government deals only with problems related to student welfare. It implies that students should not undertake an active critique of

the educational offerings or programs.

In the midst of this controversy more and more institutions are extending to their students an expanded and more formal voice in policy making. Recently, the AAUP has released a draft statement concerning student participation. The older AAUP "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" released in 1966 made only a vague and general reference to the current issue. It simply supported student participation from an educational standpoint and stated that students should be able to freely discuss, speak, and listen to views on an equal basis with the rest of the academic community without any fear of reprisal. The new draft statement reflects the increased amount of concern for this area in recent times. It is much more specific in enumerating the rights and freedoms of students to participate actively. It is based on the concept of shared authority. The AAUP suggests students should have primary responsibility for activities sponsored by the student body and be able to speak out on any other university issue. If students are not included in the membership of various governing bodies, they should, at least, be permitted to place items on the agendas of such bodies and receive prompt, complete replies to their queries.

New Governance Arrangements: Students on the Board

With the recent pressures for more student participation, several innovations in governance can be found at various institutions across the country. Some of the more popular changes have included adding a student to the board of trustees, establishing a unified all-university senate, or instituting advisory committees for administrators.

Probably the most newsmaking innovations have occurred when students were added to the governing board. Kentucky was the first state to pass enabling

legislation of this kind in 1968; it authorized the president of the student body at the public institutions to serve as non-voting members of the Boards of Regents of the state colleges and the University of Kentucky. In case the student body president is not a Kentucky resident, a special election is to be held to choose a student representative. According to President Otis Singletary of the University of Kentucky, the move was made primarily from student desire with faculty and administrative support. In Kentucky, this move has received favorable public reaction. President Singletary believes that it has given the students a greater sense of participation and feeling for the universities' problems. The one weakness he sees is the inability of one student to represent all the viewpoints of the student body and to interpret board actions to the student body. Kentucky is, however, pleased with the results of this innovation.

In early 1969 the Wyoming legislature similarly passed legislation permitting the University of Wyoming's student body president to become an ex officio, non-voting member. At Wyoming, the move was viewed as providing improved trustee-student communication.

The University of Massachusetts has also had a student added to its Board of Trustees, but as a <u>voting</u> member. This was accomplished by action of the legislature with full support by the governor. Student opinion at Massachusetts seems divided over the issue and there have been some charges of tokenism. The Massachusetts President, John W. Lederle, saw many flaws in the law. He felt the addition of students would justify the same demands from other special interest groups such as faculty, alumni, or nonprofessional employees. There was also the problem of deciding how a choice would be made from among the candidates on their three campuses. The matter was resolved by a plan to alternate the membership between the Amherst and Boston campuses from year to year.

In Maine, the Governor did appoint a student to the Board of Trustees; however, the student graduated shortly after his appointment but he still serves as a member of the Board. He was not specifically placed on the Board in order to fill the need for a student there, but rather to represent a more youthful attitude. He also has full voting privileges.

As a result of informal agreement in Connecticut by the Governor, the Board of Trustees, and the President of the University of Connecticut, the Governor appointed a student to fill a recent vacancy on this university's board. The student was a senior at appointment and is now enrolled in the law school at the university. He has full voting rights and privileges. This arrangement met generally with favorable reaction throughout the state.

The Board of Regents at the University of Washington invited the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, the President of the Associated Students of the University of Washington, and the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate to attend its meetings and participate in discussions, without vote. The move was not intended to be the final answer to differences in opinion among the various campus groups, but it is hoped that it will improve communications and facilitate a greater sense of community.

These constitute the majority of large state-related universities that have added students to their governing boards. Other institutions such as American University, George Washington University, Indiana State University, University of Toledo, and Vanderbilt University have either placed students on the board or invited them to attend and participate in board meetings. Indiana University at Bloomington has the student body president and vice president attend board meetings and participate in the discussion of various matters. While inclusion of students on the board of trustees has been the most "radical" move to date, others have simply added new student committees to confer

regularly with administrative officials on questions of policy. This represents a lesser modification of the more traditional approach.

The Student Advisory Role

Two notable examples of the advisory committee plan can be found at Utah State University and Iowa State University. At Utah State, the president has invited student leaders to meet with him and his staff on a bi-monthly basis. These meetings are informal and non-policy making, but the students plan the agenda and conduct the meeting. These meetings do aid in informing the student body about university problems and planning. The Council on Student Affairs at Iowa State consists of nine faculty and nine student members. This council is an advisory one to the Vice President for Student Affairs. This body meets bi-weekly and advises the vice president on all aspects of student life, the study of existing policy, and the need for changing or creating new policies. The vice president follows this body's advice as much as possible and interacts with it during its deliberations.

Students Added to Old and New Legislative Bodies

The most frequent method of including students in university governance has been the addition of students to presently constituted legislative bodies such as faculty senates. With the creation of new unicameral all-university legislative bodies, students, administrators, and staff, as well as faculty, are all represented in the same body.

When students are added to existing faculty senates, the change may be token, by adding a few student body or class officers as voting members. Or, there may be more sweeping changes in which several students are added and form a new segment of the old body. Examples of the former are the University

of Texas and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

During a reorganization of the faculty council at Texas, three student voting members were added to the council. These were the student body president and one delegate from each of the two student governing bodies. Virginia Polytechnic Institute added two voting student members to its University Council, a body heretofore composed only of faculty and administrators. The new members are the student body president and a graduate student representative.

On the other hand, some institutions have placed large numbers of students on their legislative bodies. New York University has added, on an experimental basis, sixteen students, or twenty-five percent of the membership, to the University Senate. The Deans Council and Faculty Council meet regularly to discuss matters of concern to them. The new student members are elected from the All-University Student Conference, which includes student senators and the presidents of the student councils of the individual schools. This experiment will continue through August, 1970, when an evaluation will be made to determine the future of this arrangement. Students are also included on most committees.

At Rutgers University, one student senator is elected to the University Senate by and from the student body of each school and college which offers degrees. Students were added during a reorganization of the senate in order to make it a more effective body. The students have full voting privileges and serve on senate committees.

New Legislative Bodies

Other institutions have created new governing organizations, which include new all-university bodies. Some have retained separate faculty and student

organizations but then created another all-university body which functions separately from these two bodies. These may or may not be superior to the individual faculty and student groups.

In response to a large number of student petitions, the University of Kansas undertook to reorganize its governance structure. The new structure retains a faculty senate and a student senate, each of which has its own areas of responsibility. Each of these senates deals with affairs that most closely affect all of their constituents. There is also a University Senate, a body composed of the Chancellor, Provosts and vice chancellors, and the faculty and student senate memberships. This body is empowered to deal with the affairs of the university which affect the entire university community, such as fiscal policies, academic procedures and requirements, long-range planning, the calendar, and student financial aid. Students hold full voting membership along with the other members.

Other universities have sought out a more unicameral structure, of which the University of New Hampshire is one. In early 1969 a new government organization was agreed upon. This was a University Senate composed of thirty students, thirty faculty, twelve administrators, and five graduate students. One should note that the New Hampshire state legislature has almost as many members as congress. The University Senate has legislative jurisdiction in the areas of student government, faculty government, and educational policy. All members have full voting privileges. The faculty members and the student members separately constitute the faculty caucus and the student caucus. These bodies do have some limited powers to deal with issues that are related exclusively to their own constituents; as such there does tend to be a discussion of issues that come before the full University Senate.

Columbia University chose a unicameral body for its new University Senate.

They rejected the idea of two parallel student and faculty assemblies because they felt there were few matters which did not justify full university discussion. The University Senate at Columbia is all inclusive; it has representatives from the tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, students, the administration, the affiliated institutions, and other groups such as the librarians, research staff, administrative staff, and alumni. These are represented approximately in a 2 + .75 + 1 + .33 + .30 + .35 ratio respectively. The University Senate has policy-making power on all matters of university-wide concern and all matters affecting more than one faculty or school. All members (approximately 100) have equal rights and privileges. At Columbia, students have also been effectively integrated into the curriculum committees of the various departments. Students do not, however, serve on all committees of the University Senate, such as the Committee on Faculty Affairs, which has jurisdiction over such matters as tenure, promotion, academic freedom, and sabbaticals.

The State University of New York at Binghamton has initiated a University Assembly including representatives from the faculty, graduate student body, undergraduate student body, and administration. The Assembly is the product of a couple of years of study and discussion. The Assembly is an integrated, unicameral body based upon a representative ratio of five faculty to three graduate and undergraduate students and two administrators. Committees contain members of all four groups. Such matters as faculty promotion, tenure, etc., are not handled by the Assembly, but through each department. However, all departments do have student advisory committees which give advice on these matters. The Binghamton governance system is perhaps one of the few that treats students nearly as equals throughout all areas of the university.

The University of Minnesota has designed a new governance system, which

features both the unicameral body and the parallel body structures. There is an all-university senate that represents all the various schools and branch campuses throughout the state. This body is a unicameral one, in which the student representatives are elected from the various schools, colleges and campuses. There is a member for each 1,000 students or major fraction thereof. The University Senate deals with and enacts regulations for all matters which concern more than one campus and the university as a whole.

On the Twin Cities Campus, the governing structure is slightly different from that of the university level. There is a Twin Cities Assembly composed of all members of the University Senate who are from the Twin Cities campus. The Assembly includes both the student and faculty members. A Faculty Assembly and Student Assembly are, however, maintained on the Twin Cities campus and these bodies do deal with matters which are the concern of one more than the other.

The above has been different examples of how various institutions have met the pressure for greater student participation in their governing structures. They are as diverse as the institutions themselves. The trend does, however, appear to be moving more and more in favor of some areas of student management in all colleges and universities.

Part II

Annotated Bibliography

The following books and articles cover the spectrum on the topic of governance. In order to best understand the increased pressure for student participation and what effect this will have upon the governing structure, one must understand the total structure. Thus, the following bibliography contains material on faculty participation, student participation, general works on organizational structure, and so on. Most of the following entries are relatively current in order to indicate the emerging trends. All of the articles and books are available at the Indiana University Library, in the library and files of the Bureau of Institutional Research, or the reading room of the Department of Higher Education, School of Education. In addition, a comprehensive "Selected Bibliography on Student Unrest and Student Participation in Academic Governance" is available from the Bureau of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota.

Articles

Alexander, William M., "Rethinking Student Government for Larger Universities," Journal of Higher Education, 40 (January, 1969), 39-46.

Since many present day students do not regard the elected student officers as their representatives, the author suggests universities should adopt a parliamentary form of student government. Those who want to be involved in student government would circulate a petition for ten to fifty students who would be willing to support the aspirants and be willing for him to represent them. Each student receiving the requisite number of signatures

would be declared elected and then would be directly responsible to those who signed his petition. This parliament would meet frequently and be directly responsible to the university president.

Beach, Mark, "Professional Versus Professorial Control of Higher Education," Educational Record, 49 (Summer, 1968), 450-65.

The author presents a brief historical account of the rise of modern administration in higher education. He shows how the former professorial system of control gave way to a specialized administrative system. He also shows that some of the issues which annually cause tensions between faculty and administration have been raised almost every year since the turn of the century.

Bloustein, Edward J., "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges," Liberal Education, 54 (October, 1968), 345-64.

This article describes the classical American college and then contrasts it with contemporary institutions. The author explains the emergence of the new activist student as a result of certain weaknesses in the classical college concept. These are the hierarchical structure of authority, fixed and ordered system of some areas of knowledge, limited set of educational functions, and the in loco parentis relationship between the student and the institution. Approximately three-fourths of this article emphasizes contemporary events.

Bowles, W. Donald, "Student Participation in Academic Governance," Educational Record, 49 (Summer, 1968), 257-62.

If students wish to achieve influence upon the academic power structures of their institution, they should learn where the power actually resides. There is a distinction between the formal and informal channels of power. Deans have less to lose than do faculty in sharing their power. The most efficient course to power for students is through the department, not through grandiose all-university schemes. The article emphasizes the three basic layers of authority as: (1) the president, (2) academic dean, and (3) department chairman.

Brogan, Howard O., "Faculty Power: Pretense and Reality in Academic Government," Journal of Higher Education, 40 (January, 1969), 23-30.

The author criticizes faculty for allowing themselves to be deceived into believing that they have academic power, when they have limited powers of decision. Too often the faculty is considered advisory rather than policy-making. If the faculty is ever to have the power it is supposed to have, it must begin by controlling its own participation in academic government. The elected representatives must be made responsible to the faculty, not to the administration.

Eberle, August W., "Tricameral System Aligns at Policy Level," College and University Business, 47 (July, 1969), 32-33, 56.

The author, a professor at Indiana University, suggests that in order to avoid future chaos on university campuses, all constituent groups should have a voice at the policy-making level. Continued control of the college board of trustees by lay members is desirable because higher educational institutions fulfill a public function. The proposals to place students and faculty on the governing board does not strengthen this concept sufficiently. Students and faculty are, nevertheless, special kinds of publics with special insights into the problems of higher education. There is, therefore, a need to give these publics (or constitutencies) an opportunity to influence the policy decisions, but this should be a thing apart from their participation in studying, teaching, and researching. Dr. Eberle proposes that a tricameral governance system be instituted. The lay governing board would be the central house and primus inter pares with the student house and faculty house. Matters would be presented to all three houses for action, but the lay board would continue to exercise final authority.

Flack, Michael J., "Innovation and the University in Crisis: Three Proposals," Educational Record, 49 (Summer, 1968), 347-49.

This article suggests three things that should be built into university

governance structures to reduce tension and avert crises. (1) Create the position of ombudsman for the purpose of effectively channelling constructive complaints in ways that would assure them fair and timely treatment. (2) Formulate a university council composed of two board members, two administrators, two faculty senate members, and two student senate members. This council could be convened by one of the four groups and would discuss policy questions. Their decision would be of all-university authority. (3) Organize a permanent "hearings" panel, which would meet once a month. Anyone could testify before it on any matter having a constructive idea for the university. In this way, anyone who wished could have his ideas heard.

Foster, Julian, "Power, Authority and Expertise: Administration in a Changing Context," Liberal Education, 54 (December, 1968), 592-600.

The article seeks to articulate ways leading to improved college and university administration. The main recommendations are: (1) that a university constitution be designed which would define and limit the authority of all groups, from the trustees to the students; (2) that administrators should not approach their tasks as authority figures, but rather primus inter pares with other groups and only as a result of their greater experience, larger resources of time, and larger staff; and (3) the central thesis of this article is that administrators should be chosen for their expertise and not for their estimated capacity to wield authority.

"The Governance of the Universities I," Daedalus, 98 (Fall, 1969), 1030-1091.

"The Governance of the Universities II," Daedalus, 98 (Fall, 1969), 1092-1154.

These two articles, appearing in the same issue of Daedalus, are the transcripts of group discussions on university governance sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The two articles represent two groups, composed of professors, administrators, and representatives of business and government. They discussed several of the problems of governance facing

universities today. Their opposing viewpoints illustrate the controversy over most of the important issues.

Halladay, D. W., Kauffman, Joseph F., Price, William, and Skutt, Richard, "The Role of the Students," Paper presented at Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C., November, 1968.

These four authors agree that students should have a greater role in the governance of universities. Halladay believes that students should be concerned with the quality of their education and thereby have a legitimate need to be heard in the councils making educational policy. Kauffman explains how the conflicting English and German traditions in American higher education have led us to be confused over the role that students should play. Price sees the main task of a student in college to be that of finding his purpose in life; this can be achieved, in part, when students are permitted to become catalytic agents in their own educational development which can occur through responsible participation in the structure which governs their education. Skutt illustrates methods and means whereby students may be effectively incorporated into university governance.

Hallberg, Edmond C., "Academic Congress: A Direction in University Governance," Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (May, 1969), 538-40.

The author's thesis is that any governmental form should grow out of mutual need and purpose expressed by those governed, but one of the following alternatives is necessary to achieve it: (1) students will find a place as "necessary" representatives in the existing faculty government; (2) each power group will retain a separate organization and vie for power; or (3) an all-university government will be formed. The author discusses many of the arguments pro and con concerning student participation.

Heffner, Ray L., "The Student Voice in Institutional Policy," AGB Reports [Association of Governing Boards], 10 (February, 1968), 3-10.

The author, a president of Brown University and Dean of Faculties at

Indiana University, discusses the role of the president in modern day university governance. His prescription for progress includes: enunciating institutional philosophy and seeking the understanding of all elements in the academic community; accepting students as junior partners in the enterprise; and providing an environment conducive to experimentation where alternatives can develop so that students are not faced with the choice of either accepting or rejecting "the system."

Hodgkinson, Harold L., "Governance and Factions, Who Decides Who Decides?" The Research Reporter, 3 (#3, 1968), 4-7.

The author briefly outlines some problems that exist on almost all campuses. He explains that often a president is erroneously held accountable for events when, in actual fact, much of his power has been eroded by the faculty; furthermore, the faculty has not fully accepted the responsibility for its actions. He defines three major sources of friction in governance relationships. First, because budget allocations and information regarding them are often unavailable, the faculty believes that the business manager is making academic decisions. Second, on campuses where growth has been rapid, the delegation of authority has not been commensurate; thus, subordinates are often faced with tasks for which they may lack the authority. Third, a particularly visible administrative office, such as the president or especially the dean of students, may cause friction. The dean of students does not fit neatly into the administrative structure and has little impact on final decisions, but faculty see him as a threat because students are able to talk freely, without fear of reprisal, to the dean about weaknesses in the academic program. Hodgkinson sees a number of flaws in the many recent proposals for improvement in campus governance and thus suggests exploring the possibility of an "electronic town meeting," which would allow direct participation of all concerned people.

Hodgkinson, Harold L., "Ideal Governance Structure Would Be Larger and Smaller -- Simultaneously," College and University Business, 48 (April, 1970), 65-68.

In this article, Hodgkinson states his belief that all segments of American society are losing trust in one another. Therefore, he sees the current trend toward all-university senates as the last gasp of the traditional concept of representative participation. The real problem is that existing governments and their quaint structure must function for a much larger population both in society and on campus, but yet we expect the old forms to continue. Studies have shown that a person in a small setting experiences greater motivation and satisfaction in belonging to the small group. Hodgkinson's own studies have shown that as the size of the university increases, the percentage of institutions reporting increased student protests also increases. The best hope for large institutions, therefore, is to decentralize their governance structure in those areas that directly affect the quality of life of the participants. Since there must be linkages across autonomous schools or segments of the university, the matter of logistics and support services should be handled in the largest possible context, while decisions affecting individual lives and commitments should be made in the smallest possible units.

"Issues in University Governance," A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance, New York, Institute of Higher Education, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, September, 1968.

The purpose of this colloquium was to identify more specifically the governance issues that universities face and bring to bear on these, scholarship from relevant fields. The general conclusions were as follows. First, the rush of social events has caught up with and outdistanced academic institutions, most of which have not adequately adapted their structures

to the new conditions. Second, colleges and universities have been drawn into the mainstream of American life and have lost the protective cloak of isolation. The universities remain, however, relatively powerless organizations in society, and the many new publics which they now serve are usually interested only in limited activities, rather than the welfare of the institution at large. Third, the balance of power within higher education has shifted drastically. Administrative power has declined and the ideal of "collegiality" and faculty democracy has risen. This has not, however, led to greater independence for curricular development and innovation, but rather to stagnation since many faculties are requiring a consensus of all curricular decisions. Fourth, the student has been disenfranchised. Since the mid-1950's, the universities have been in a seller's market. The students could either buy the commodity at the going rate or suffer. Thus, students lost bargaining power at institutions no longer dependent upon their patronage. Fifth, the students and the culture have changed. The students are more affluent, cosmopolitan, knowledgeable, and questioning. They are likely to challenge the adequacy of the present governance systems to deal with the large problems facing the university. The report also contains the summary of speeches made before the colloquium by such people as Walter Metzer, W.H. Cowley, David Riesman, Alan Westin, and Carl Davidson.

Johnstone, D. Bruce, "The Student and His Power," Journal of Higher Education, 40 (March, 1969), 205-18.

The article analyzes student militancy as it relates to the decision making role of students. It points out six methods of exercising informal or indirect student power that would bring the total student body into a decision making role. These are: (1) lower level planning, such as the joint planning of individual courses through the departments; (2) individual programs, such as credit by examination or independent study; (3) indications of consumer

preference; (4) involvement in the faculty reward system through publishing, course and teacher evaluations, or compelling faculty to prepare students for externally administered examinations; (5) exposure of alternatives in experimental colleges; and (6) the expression of dissent through lobbying, ad hoc committees, or underground publications.

Kerlinger, Fred N., "Student Participation in University Educational Decision Making," The Record, 70 (October, 1968), 45-51.

The author is strongly opposed to permitting students a voice in educational policy making. He states there are three principles necessary for effective decision-making. The first is legitimacy, the right to make decisions in a specified area; second is competence, which is defined as the requisite knowledge and background that make it possible for a person to participate rationally; and third is responsibility, the accountability of a person for the implications and consequences of his decision. Students should participate only in those decisions where they have all of these qualifications and by definition, they do not have the substantive and experiential competence to make educational decisions.

Laser, Marvin, "Toward a Sense of Community: The Role of the Faculty Member in the Formulation of Institutional Policy," Journal of Higher Education, 38 (February, 1967), 61-69.

This article deals with faculty-administrative conflict. It explains the reasons for this conflict basically from the diversity of the roles played by professors and central administrators. The goal is a sense of community, but the way to achieve this is by enlarging and strengthening the academic senate. This causes the administration to be more responsible when dealing with recommendations of the senate.

McConnell, T. R., "Campus Governance - Faculty Participation," The Research Reporter, 5 (#1, 1970), 1-4.

This article points out one of the hazards of faculty participation in

academic senates. Studies found that in many institutions a small faculty oligarchy takes over the running of faculty government. The same people are elected from year to year and serve on the most influential committees. Studies also found greater faculty-administrative rapport where administrators were included in the academic senate, but did not prove conclusively that this relationship was a causal one.

McDonough, John R., "The Role of Students in Governing the University," AGB Reports [Association of Governing Boards], 10 (April, 1968), 24-31.

The author opposes active student participation in university policy making. He views the student as a consumer, who can if he so chooses go elsewhere, and this in itself is an effective power. Still, students should be allowed to be heard on an advisory basis. Even this type of participation will complicate the process because students usually see a problem as having greater urgency than necessary, their short tenure means a high rate of turnover, and students will not have to live with the consequences of their decisions.

Milton, Ohmer, "Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making," Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education Bureau of Research, 1968.

The purpose of this survey was to ascertain faculty attitudes about student involvement in determining campus policies. The survey was taken at different types of colleges and universities in Tennessee. The major conclusions of the survey were that, first, students should participate extensively in determining non-academic policies. Second, students should evaluate teachers, but the results should be seen only by the teacher. Third, faculty members believed students had no place on governing boards. Fourth, the faculty members stated that students' ideas should be heard, but there was no consensus on how this should be arranged.

Mitau, G. Theodore, "Student Participation in Campus Government," Paper presented to Student Convocation, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota, February 18, 1969.

The author favors student participation in university decisions which affect their personal lives, their courses of study, and the campus environment. In order to maintain a dynamic and viable campus, a participatory campus democracy must be instituted. Campuses have become political settings, and thus, they must accommodate all kinds of views from within the various groups there.

Moran, William E., "The Study of University Organizations," Journal of Higher Education, 39 (March, 1968), 144-51.

This article briefly explains some of the different organizational models found within a university. The article stresses the fact that the university is not one type of organization but rather composed of several different types. The author believes that perhaps it would be well to start talking of a university as a federal organization rather than trying to consider it as a unitary one.

Mundinger, Donald C., "The University Ombudsman: His Place on the Campus," Journal of Higher Education, 38 (December, 1967), 493-99.

One popular suggestion in recent years has been the addition of an ombudsman to university officialdom. This article attempts to point out the advantages of having such an office. The main task of the ombudsman would be to serve as a spokesman in any case of inequity. He would have the power to inquire into administrative guidelines, to identify wrong doings by administration functionaries, and to assist the president and governing board in supervising the administration. The ombudsman would derive his power from publicity and moral suasion, but would not have the power to reverse any formal decision.

Muston, Ray A., "Governance Changes Are Catching Colleges by Surprise, A National Survey Shows," College and University Business, 47 (July, 1969), 29-31.

This article grew out of an Indiana University doctoral dissertation. The survey found that the most frequent involvement of faculty and students in governance was membership on standing and advisory committees. The types of change in governance structures were almost as numerous as the total number of institutions reporting change.

Newburn, H. K., "Faculty and Administration in the Governance of the University," Educational Record, 45 (Summer, 1964), 255-64.

The author recognizes that there is a large area of disagreement between faculty and administrators over their proper roles in governance. He notes several characteristics of higher education that must be dealt with when defining proper faculty participation: (1) The growth in the complexity and size of institutions causes the president to be removed from direct contact with individual faculty members and with faculty governing units. (2) Decision making is dispersed across the campus, creating hazards for the development of any sustained logical and unified policy of participation on the part of the faculty. (3) Only the president is forced to see to the unified functioning of the institution while the faculty and other administrators see only their small area. (4) Because of outside pressures, the president and other administrative officials devote much of their time to things not central to the accomplishment of the mission of the university, its educational policy. Despite these problems there is considerable room for sharing the decision making process and ways to do this should be sought by all.

Pfnister, Allan O., "The Role of Faculty in University Governance," Journal of Higher Education, 41 (June, 1970), 430-49.

While favoring more of a collegial atmosphere and greater faculty voice in institutional policy, the author realizes there are several problems in

faculty participation. Faculty members tend to behave like scholars when they investigate a problem in a leisurely, well-documented fashion. This method, however, often comes into conflict with the immediate demand for an answer in crisis situations. Thus, faculty must develop forms of organization which allow elected or appointed representatives to confer quickly and to act with the power to bind the academic community to their decisions. All too often faculty members are more concerned with their discipline than their institution. Their research orientation breeds an irresponsible attitude toward the institution; the faculty must overcome this attitude if they desire more control of decision making. The privilege of making decisions cannot be separated from responsibility for the decisions made.

Powell, Robert S., Jr., "Student Power and the Student Role in Institutional Governance," Liberal Education, 55 (March, 1969), 24-31.

The author, a militant student, speaks out for a revolution in the university. He wants to remove fear as the primary motivating force on the student in the university and replace it with an experience of self-development which will create a sense of personal responsibility in the student for his own decisions. Student power is also seeking expression through creation of a democracy in the university. This movement wants the power to make rules, not just to influence their change. The author desires exclusive student control over the students' own personal affairs and supports shared authority in the area of curriculum, grades, and overall institutional policy-making.

Singer, J. David, "Toward Collegial Government in Universities," Educational Record, 50 (Winter, 1969), 101.

This article offers some suggestions to help reduce the frequency and severity of campus disruptions. The author proposes that university governance structures should be changed to become similar to a parliamentary

government. Administrators would hold office at the pleasure of the faculty; a two-thirds vote of no confidence would be sufficient to remove them from office. Students would have no direct vote, but would have unlimited rights of petition coupled with a much greater access to both the faculty and administration. The faculty could ask for the dismissal of all or some administrative officers, with the regents or trustees retaining some veto power.

Wilson, Logan, "Changing University Governance," Educational Record, 50 (Fall, 1969), 388-404.

The author discusses the current changing scene in higher education and the demands of many of the groups for greater participation. He sees, however, that in the next few years the university will be more affected by what happens outside its walls than inside. These external constraints must be kept in mind when attempting to change the governance structure. He lists some axioms which must be followed if a governance system is to work: (1) No group, trustees or others, can have absolute power. (2) Order and freedom must be maintained alongside freedom and justice. (3) The university cannot be transformed into a microcosm of the body politic, a welfare agency, an ivory tower, or an action arena without ceasing to become a university. Participatory democracy cannot work within a university unless all its publics, such as alumni, students' parents, state legislators, and benefactors, have a stake in the participation. Most importantly, it must be remembered that universities exist for the good of the larger society, not the benefit of those directly connected with them.

Books

AAHE-NEA Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Washington, D.C., 1967.

This study was undertaken because of rising faculty discontent in many institutions around the country. The task force made a number of recommendations

for the improvement of the faculty's role in governance. They concluded that an effective system of campus governance should be built on the concept of "shared authority" between the faculty and the administration. Several types of organizations can provide for faculty representation. They are an internal organization, such as a faculty senate, an external organization, such as the AAUP, or a bargaining agency. The task force believed that through an academic senate, which contained both faculty members and administrators, the concept of "shared authority" would be best fulfilled.

Abbott, Frank C., editor, Faculty-Administrative Relationships, Washington, D.C., 1958.

This older work is the product of a conference on faculty and administrative relationships. Speeches of the various conference participants are included. Various papers represent the administrative and professorial points of view. The book also contains papers which attempt to relate experiences in the behavioral sciences, industrial organization, labor relations, and public administration; a better understanding should lead to better academic administration.

Carr, Alden J., Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration, Washington, D.C., 1959.

This study is also older and thus dated. It attempts to ascertain the areas in which students participate in making general policy and how this participation takes place from a survey of the member institutions of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. It holds that participation should be increased if accompanied by adequate evaluation. The book also contains a short historical section.

Committee on the Student in Higher Education, The Student in Higher Education, New Haven, Connecticut, 1968.

This Hazen Foundation supported study is concerned with the present day quality of student life in the broadest sense. The Committee did conclude, however, that students are permitted little real involvement in planning their

own education or in shaping their educational environment. Thus, the Committee recommended that student participation in educational policy making be increased. They advocated student representation at the highest levels, including the governing board, in order to prevent future student victimization. The Committee also proposed the democratization of rule making and rule enforcement on the campus.

Corson, John J., Governance of Colleges and Universities, New York, 1960.

This book, although a decade old, has become one of the standard works on college administration. Corson sees governance as the task of establishing rules and making the succession of decisions that are required to relate and order various subdivisions which will make them productive. The study, based on Corson's observations of fifteen colleges and universities of various types, is essentially descriptive. He describes the roles of the university-wide officers, the academic officers, the faculty, and the departments. He does, however, pose questions for further study and discussion at the end of most chapters.

Demerath, Nicholas J., Stephens, Richard W., and Taylor, R. Robb, Power, Presidents, and Professors, New York, 1967.

The authors undertake to describe the differences in organizational behavior of the president and of the faculty, particularly as they function within the departments. The book is built around some minor organizational changes and alterations in administrative style at the University of North Carolina. The authors study the situation before and after the changes. The changes were to make the bureaucratic structure function more efficiently and change the administrative style to be more orderly, more bureaucratic, but less routinized. They termed this new system collegialized management.

Dykes, Archie R., Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making, Washington, D. C., 1968.

The purpose of this study of the faculty of a large mid-western university was to determine the faculty's conceptions of its "proper" role in decision making, its satisfaction and dissatisfactions with the perceived status quo in governance, its reasons for participating, the impediments to participating, and how the process operates. The study concluded the following things. (1) Faculty members overwhelmingly indicated they should have a strong, active, and influential role in decisions, especially educational ones, but revealed a strong reticence to give the time this role would require. (2) There was a reluctance to recognize or accept the new realities of participation, as many longed for the simple direct democracy of old, rather than the more modern necessity of representative government. (3) There was a strong tendency to dichotomize decisions into "educational" and "noneducational" categories and ascribe degrees of faculty control accordingly. This overlooks the interrelatedness of decisions. (4) Much of the tension between faculty and administrators stems from the belief that any increase in administrative power and influence must necessarily result in a decrease in the faculty's power. This assumes a finite power potential, a zero sum game, which is an invalid assumption. (5) Serious misconceptions existed about the processes through which decisions were made and the role the faculty played in them, which led to a sense of distrust. (6) Faculty tend to have a simplistic view of the distribution of influence and power in their own community. They attributed to the administration vastly more power than it actually possessed.

Etzioni, Amitai, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York, 1961.

This book is a comparative study in organizational theory. The author takes different types of organizations, such as business, military, prison, welfare, and a university, and compares and contrasts them in order to learn more about all of them.

Foote, Caleb, Mayer, Henry, and Associates, The Culture of the University: Governance and Education, San Francisco, 1968.

This book constitutes the report of the faculty-student Study Commission on University Governance appointed in January, 1967, by the Berkeley Academic Senate and the Senate of Associated Students. While the Commission was concerned with the total governance structure on the Berkeley campus of the University of California, there was much concern for increasing student participation. They develop a general rationale for student participation while giving specific attention to educational policy making and welfare services.

Frankel, Charles, Education and the Barricades, New York, 1968.

The author undertakes to refute the arguments of the student radicals demanding more power in the university. He does not refute the position that students have a right to be heard in university policy making decisions and councils, but he believes the radicals are using the wrong arguments. For instance, he makes a distinction between the students' "rights" to access to decision making and the desirability of that move.

Lunn, Harry H., Jr., The Student's Role in College Policy-Making, Washington, D. C., 1957.

Although this book is nearly fifteen years old and therefore somewhat dated, it is useful as a point of departure to dramatize how much student participation has changed over the period. The book is an outgrowth of the Commission on Student Personnel of the American Council on Education. It is mainly a descriptive account of student involvement in a variety of areas of institutional administration and policy development.

Lunsford, Terry F., editor, The Study of Academic Administration, Boulder, Colorado, 1963.

This book is a compendium of materials and discussions at a workshop on academic administration and university governance sponsored by the Western

Interstate Commission on Higher Education. The articles are speeches made by participants at the workshop. A pertinent one is "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," by G. Lester Anderson, who discusses the problems of attempting to classify the university as an organization type and gives a brief sketch of the different types. Another is "Faculty Organization and Authority," by Burton R. Clark, who shows how faculty organization has evolved over the years in response to changes in higher education.

Millett, John D., The Academic Community, New York, 1962.

The title of this book is an adequate statement of the author's position. He believes that the university operates along community lines, but that this type of organization should be strengthened. He proposes various ways through which this can be accomplished effectively.

Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations, Washington, D. C., 1970.

This special committee was appointed by the American Council on Education to investigate the causes of campus unrest. It included Mrs. Richard Innskeep, an Indiana University trustee. The committee investigated all aspects of student-faculty-administration-trustee relations. In the area of governance, it recommended that: (1) The processes of academic governance must be seen by all major groups as essentially fair, and thus "due process" must be enlarged to include broad participation in the deliberations on important issues. (2) Each institution should make every attempt to establish effective communications among its various groups, publics, and constitutencies. (3) Joint administrator-faculty-student committees should be established wherever possible to assist in resolving problems. And, (4) The effective functioning of a university depends upon the shared commitment of all parties to the principle of institutional self-governance and the assumption of the responsibilities

that idea implies.

Stroup, Herbert, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, New York, 1966.

This book studies higher education as a bureaucracy. The author discusses the anatomy of the university, the trend toward increasing size and specialization, the function of college administrators, the nature of power and authority, and the forces of myth and charisma. He presents some conclusions, which can be taken as possible approaches to remedying the disabilities of a bureaucracy.

Vaccaro, Louis C. and Covert, James T., editors, Student Freedom in American Higher Education, New York, 1969.

This book is a collection of essays which discusses all aspects of student freedom. The articles consider the negative and positive aspects of this growing freedom. Two articles pertain heavily to governance. Theodore N. Farris develops an analogy of the student as an apprentice. Although he favors heeding and assisting responsible student opinion, he cautions against listening to more radical demands for university control. Robert M. Crane traces the development of governance as an issue in the matter of student freedom. He also explains some of the factors that make governance such an attractive issue.

* *

It should be noted that many of the state legislative and professional association studies of student unrest contain a large amount of comment about the responsibilities of students, staff and faculty. Most of these reports are just beginning to circulate. However, they seem (or their press reports suggest) to be much more concerned with actual conduct and less with structure or procedure. This is the latest trend which seems evident; the actions of state legislatures in the next six months should clearly define this phase of change.

J. S. W.